

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending; Claim 6, 14, and 15 are amended; and no claims are newly added or canceled herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 6 was objected to; Claims 1-5, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Granberg (U.S. Pat. No. 4,014,739); and Claims 6-10 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Randall (U.S. Pat. No. 2,600,265).

With regard to the objection to Claim 6, Claim 6 has been amended to recite a mold clamping force. It is therefore respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-5, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Granberg, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a paper making mold, wherein a fixing member is directly attached to the peripheral part to fix the net, such that the net is free from a force applied to the fixing member.

Claim 11 also recites that the first fixing member is directly attached to the first papermaking part, such that the first net is free from a force applied to the first fixing member.

The outstanding Office Action asserts at page 6 that in order to go from the position shown in Figure 2 of Granberg to the position in Figure 3 of Granberg, some force must have been applied to move element 42b. However, Granberg describes that when it is desired to change the foraminous mold means 14 to provide a differently configured base element 18, or when necessary to maintenance the base element 18 and/or screens 30 and 32, the retainer

member 48 may be removed from the associated annular groove 44 and the base member 36 and the base number again manipulated to a position shown in Figure 3 allowing removal of the base member 18 and associated screens 30 and 32 from the support frame means 16.¹ As is evident from this description, if element 42b is equated to the fixing member of Claim 1, the fixing member of Granberg would not be directly attached to the peripheral part to fix the net during the transition between Figures 2 and 3.

Accordingly, Granberg fails to disclose or suggest a fixing member is directly attached to the peripheral part to fix the net, such that the net is free from a force applied to the fixing member, as recited in Claim 1. It is also respectfully submitted that Claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Granberg. It is therefore respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claims 1-5, 11, and 13 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 6-10 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Randall, that rejection is also traversed.

Claim 6 recites that the part of the net that covers the peripheral part is positioned so that the flange prevents the net from receiving a mold clamping force received by the flange. Claim 14 recites analogous features.

Randall relates to a pulp molding die. Randall describes that die body 10 is open at its upper end to permit the die proper, indicated generally by 11, to be inserted axially into and withdrawn from the die body for purposes of replacement or repair.² Element 33 of Randall is a conventional die ring to define the edge of the molded article. Ring 33 is described by Randall as adapted to be removably fastened to the upper open end of the die body means of threaded studs 34.³ The Office Action refers to the flange of Randall as being the element to which ring 33 is attached by stud 34. However, Applicants note that element 29 of Randall is

¹ Granberg, col. 6, lines 40-49.

² Randall, col. 3, lines 40-43.

³ Id. at col. 4, lines 51-55.

described as the top flange.⁴ Even assuming that the flange of Randall were as explained in the Office Action, the flange of Randall would not receive the mold clamping force recited in Claims 6 and 14.


Specifically, the present specification describes at page 9 that the clamping force recited in Claims 6 and 14 refers to a clamping force exerted on the upper surface of the flange that is not directly exerted on the nets *when two molds are clamped together*.⁵ However, the mold of Randall does not require a second mold to form a molded article. Because Randall does not disclose or suggest that two molds are clamped together, Randall necessarily fails to disclose or suggest a mold clamping force.

Therefore, Randall fails to disclose or suggest that the part of the net that covers the peripheral part is positioned so that the flange prevents the net from receiving a mold clamping force received by the flange, as recited in Claims 6 and 14. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



J. Derek Mason, Ph.D.

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 35,270

Katherine D. Pauley

Registration No. 50,607

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
KDP:smi

I:\ATTY\KDP\21'S\216009US\216009 AM 4.5.DOC

⁴ Id. at col. 4, line 29.

⁵ Specification, page 9, lines 9-11.